



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,653	12/03/2008	Torben Falk Orntoft	ORNTOFT 2	8207
1444 7590 08/20/2010 BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			EXAMINER AEDER, SEANE	
			ART UNIT 1642	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/20/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/584,653

Applicant(s)

ORNOT ET AL.

Examiner

SEAN E. AEDER

Art Unit

1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 68-135 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 68-135 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 68-107, 121-124, and 128, drawn to methods of classifying cancer comprising determining the microsatellite status of a tumor and determining a prognostic marker from a plurality of gene expression products.

Group II, claim(s) 108-111, drawn to a method for reducing malignancy comprising contacting a tumor cell with one or more peptides.

Group III, claim(s) 112-115, drawn to a method for reducing malignancy comprising introducing one or more genes into a tumor cell.

Group IV, claim(s) 116-119, drawn to a method for reducing malignancy comprising introducing one or more probes into tumor cells to allow said one or more probes to hybridize to one or more genes.

Group V, claim(s) 120, drawn to methods of producing antibodies comprising immunizing a mammal with one or a distinct combination of expression products and obtaining antibodies.

Group VI, claim(s) 125 and 129, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising one or more polypeptide.

Group VII, claim(s) 126 and 130, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising one or more genes.

Group VIII, claim(s) 127 and 131, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising one or more probes.

Group IX, claim(s) 132-135, drawn to a kit comprising one or more markers and instructions for use.

The inventions listed as groups I-IX do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The technical feature linking groups I-IX appears to be that they all relate to the special technical feature of methods of classifying cancer comprising determining the microsatellite status of a tumor and determining a prognostic marker from a plurality of gene expression products.

However, Dietmaier et al (Cancer Research, 57: 4749-4756) teaches methods of classifying cancer comprising determining the microsatellite status of a tumor and determining a prognostic marker from a plurality of gene expression products (see paragraph spanning pages 4750-4751, in particular).

Therefore, the technical feature linking the inventions of groups I-IX does not constitute a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, as it does not define a contribution over the prior art.

Accordingly, groups I-IX are not so linked by the same or a corresponding special technical feature as to form a single general inventive concept.

Species

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

Group I is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of methods comprising determining the microsatellite status of a tumor and determining a prognostic marker from a plurality of gene expression products. Each species is identified by one or a distinct combination of polynucleotide or polypeptide expression products. The species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The methods of the above species differ at least in method steps, reagents, response variables, and/or criteria for success such that one species could not be interchanged with the other. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Group II is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species methods for reducing malignancy comprising contacting a tumor cell with one or more peptides. Each species is identified by one or a distinct combination of peptides. The species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The methods of the above species differ at least in method steps, reagents, and/or response variables, and criteria for success such that one species could not be interchanged with the other. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Group III is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of methods for reducing malignancy comprising introducing one or more genes into a tumor cell. Each species is identified as one or a specific combination of genes. The species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The methods of the above species differ at least in method steps, reagents and/or response variables, and criteria for success such that one species could not be interchanged with the other. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Group IV is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of methods for reducing malignancy comprising introducing one or more probes into tumor cells to allow said one or more probes to hybridize to one or more genes. Each species is identified by one or a specific combination of probes. The species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The methods of the above species differ at least in method steps, reagents and/or dosages such that one species could not be interchanged with the other. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Group V is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of methods of producing antibodies comprising immunizing a mammal with one or a

distinct combination of expression products and obtaining antibodies. Each species is identified by one or a distinct combination of expression products. The species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The methods of the above species differ at least in objectives, method steps, reagents and/or and criteria for success such that one species could not be interchanged with the other. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Group VI is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of pharmaceutical compositions comprising one or more polypeptide. Each species is identified by one polypeptide or a specific combination of polypeptides. The species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The species represent separate and distinct products which are made by materially different methods, and are used in materially different methods which have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Group VII is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of pharmaceutical compositions comprising one or more genes. Each species is identified by one or a distinct combination of genes. The species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The species represent separate and distinct products which are made by materially different methods, and are used in materially different methods which have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Group VIII is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of pharmaceutical compositions comprising one or more probes. Each species is identified by one or a distinct combination of probes. The species do not relate to a

single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The species represent separate and distinct products which are made by materially different methods, and are used in materially different methods which have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Group IX is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species of kits comprising one or more markers and instructions for use. Each species is identified by one or a distinct combination of markers. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The species represent separate and distinct products which are made by materially different methods, and are used in materially different methods which have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SEAN E. AEDER whose telephone number is (571)272-8787. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sean E Aeder/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1642